

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF JUNE 27, 2005

2005-0392 – Omid Shakeri (Applicant) **William M. Carrillo, Trustee** (Owner): Application for related proposals on a 15,600 square foot site located at **542 West Fremont Avenue** (near Sydney Drive) in an R-2/PD (Low-Medium Density Residential/Planned Development) Zoning District. (APN: 323-10-025, 026) (Mitigated Negative Declaration) KD

- **Special Development Permit** to construct 3 new homes
- **Parcel Map** to split two lots into three lots

Kelly Diekmann, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. This proposal is for the demolition of one existing home with accessory structures and the development of three detached single-family homes each averaging 2900 sq. ft. in size. There are deviations required regarding minimum lot size. Staff is able to support the project in general due to the creation of individual lots and the ability of the project to comply with all zoning setback and open space requirements and conform to the Single-Family Design Techniques. There are some minor Conditions of Approval (COA) relating to architectural detail and attention and enhancements.

Comm. Babcock asked if there are basements as the diagram of Parcel 3 in Attachment C, page 17 of 17 is a little confusing. Mr. Diekmann said he does not think there are any basements and that the diagram is actually an overlay of the existing structures that will be demolished.

Comm. Hungerford asked about a Coast Live Oak tree referenced in the report “intended to be preserved at this time”, and whether that means there is an option that this tree might be removed. Mr. Diekmann said unless there is an extraordinary circumstance during construction that requires the tree come down, the tree will remain. The COA at this time requires it be retained.

Comm. Klein said on his site visit he noticed some grating probably related to a basement. Specifically as a COA, do we normally put how the basement will be filled in, how concrete is taken away, as an environmental concern, etc. Mr. Diekmann answered no, that normally on single-family homes this item is not traditionally addressed during a planning decision.

Chair Moylan opened the public hearing.

Omid Shakeri, applicant, representing the Ridgcrest Group, said the proposal is for three single-family homes where four could be added. Mr. Shakeri wanted to clarify several items required in the COAs that have now possibly been addressed. The first is in reference to Corner Lot 3, regarding the roofline being

lowered, the porch is now different and the floor plan on Lot 3 now different. On the other two lots, there have been changes to the elevations to satisfy the COAs. The applicant requested that it be noted that COA 3.C.vi. has been addressed. Chair Moylan commented that that COA referenced was not real clear. Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, clarified that the "greater degree of variability than the other two" means that if you start with the three plans, one had to be differentiated even more than it was already differentiated. Mr. Shakeri also referenced COA 3.C.iii. regarding the use foam accents. He said for the Mediterranean style home, the foam is more appropriate and has advantages over wood such as less leakage and more detailing options and would like to use more foam on this particular project. One last item was to address a letter from a neighbor, Ms. Castelino. He met with her to address her concerns. She had a concern wanting some of the trees close to her home removed. The applicant was planning on keeping an oak and a fig tree that are close to her house, but is willing to remove the trees at the Commission's direction. Ms. Castelino's other issue is with one window on the second floor of Lot 1. Mr. Shakeri has agreed to look at the plans and try to avoid her windows as much as possible.

Comm. Simons asked for clarification from staff on the use of foam. He thought that foam had ease of damage and durability issues. Mr. Diekmann said that the durability issue is more of a concern on high-use areas so it is not good for doors, but is okay for a second-story window. Mr. Diekmann said that foam allows for the better detailing than wood so foam vs. wood has to be looked at on a design-by-design basis. The two issues with foam vs. wood to consider are the durability and the design craftsmanship. Comm. Simons asked staff if they would consider a modification to the COA by the end of the review of the item.

Comm. Hungerford commented that different builders have said they felt foam was less durable. He asked the applicant what his experience was with foam durability. Mr. Shakeri said he has been working with foam for 10 years and feels that wood can wear out if not well taken care of and foam is easier to repair and less costly for the future owners.

Chair Moylan said that in the Study Session there was discussion of differentiating Units 1 and 2. He asked the applicant if one plan could just be flipped. Mr. Shakeri answered that there is a street light and a utility box that make it difficult to flip the plan.

Jennie Castelino, neighbor next to the project, thanked the staff and Commission for the opportunity to speak. She said the trees along the fence have been a problem over the years as they are messy and she has tried to keep a low maintenance yard but the trees prevent that. Another concern she has was mentioned in her letter, Attachment E. item 4, regarding the driveway location for Parcel 1 and the need for a traffic rated lid for utility boxes. She also asked that item 10 be addressed as she feels the house is too close to the parcel line. She also made several recommendations regarding the parallel line of the street and

the fencing, requesting changes she would like to see in the construction plan. She also requested to find out what kind of trees will be planted.

Mr. Shakeri said the fencing or sound wall is a requirement of the sound study and must meet those requirements.

Chair Moylan closed the public hearing.

Comm. Simons asked staff if they have made a modification to the COA about the foam issue. Mr. Diekmann said that staff is okay with amending COA 3. to state that foam accents are acceptable with intricate detailing and may be used with accent features in trim. Comm. Simons asked if there are any exclusions on doorways or high-use areas. Mr. Diekmann said this would be looked at in the review of the final design. Mr. Diekmann said COA 3.C.i. may need to be modified. There are issues regarding the driveway and the utility box and a cost limit may need to be set to modify the lots if the Commission is interested in revising the floor plan.

Comm. Klein moved for Alternative 2., to approve the Special Development Permit and Tentative Map with modified conditions, updating 3.C.iii, regarding foam accents to be used sparingly, updated as per staff recommendations and item 3.C.i., to have staff review the layout of Parcel 1 to see if the design can be flipped in a non-cost prohibitive way. Comm. Babcock seconded.

Comm. Klein commented that as far as flipping Parcel 1, it would add some variety. He applauds the applicant for not fully utilizing the lot (three houses instead of four). This will be good for community and he commended the applicant for considering the neighbor's concerns.

Comm. Simons asked staff for clarification, if the utility box concern was related to Lot 1. Staff said yes.

FINAL ACTION:

Comm. Klein made a motion on Item 2005-0392 for Alternative 2., to approve the Special Development Permit and Tentative Map with modified conditions: modification to Condition of Approval (COA) 3.C.iii., foam accents are to be used sparingly updated as per staff recommendations; modification to COA 3.C.i., have staff review the layout of Parcel 1. to see if floor plan can actually be flipped in a non-cost prohibitive way. Comm. Babcock seconded.

Motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

Item is appealable to the City Council no later than July 12, 2005.